UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,750	11/13/2001	Olivier Hericourt	FR920000073US1	4960

26502 7590 04/20/2005

IBM CORPORATION
IPLAW IQ0A/40-3
1701 NORTH STREET
ENDICOTT, NY 13760

EXAMINER	
ABYANEH, ALI S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2133	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/007,750	HERICOURT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ali S. Abyaneh	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 November 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 November 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

4

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated Paul C. Van Oorschot et al. (US Patent NO. 6,134,550)

Regarding Claim 1

Van Oorschot teaches a method for filtering certificates issued from one or more certificate authorities (CA), the method comprising the steps of: receiving a certificate and storing the certificate (column 9, lines 27); preventing use of the certificate until validation (column 1, lines 50-55); identifying a certificate authority that has issued the certificate (column 5, lines 7-14); identifying a certificate authority filter by referring to a table, that comprises identification of at least one certificate authority filter(column4, lines 52-62); sending a request to the identified certificate authority filter (column 5, lines

14-17); receiving from the certificate authority filter a response to the request, the response comprising information related to the certificate authority that has issued the certificate and a public key of the certificate authority that has issued the certificate (column 5, lines 4-23); determining according to the response whether the certificate authority is a trusted certificate authority; and validating the certificate if the certificate authority that has issued the certificate is a trusted certificate authority (column 5, lines 14-25)..

Regarding Claim 2

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method comprising the step of: discarding the certificate if the response indicates that the certificate authority that has issued the certificate is not a trusted certificate authority (column 8, lines 13-22).

Regarding Claim 3

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the step of identifying the certificate authority that has issued the certificate comprises the further step of: retrieving an identification of the certificate authority from the certificate (column 2, lines 26-28 and column 5, lines lines 4-13).

Regarding Claim 4

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the step of sending a request to the identified certificate authority filter comprises the further step of: including in said request an identification of the certificate authority that has issued the certificate (column 5, lines 7-13).

Regarding Claim 5

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the response received from the certificate authority filter comprises a level of trust assigned to the certificate authority, and wherein the step of determining according to the response whether the certificate authority is a trusted certificate authority comprises the further step of: checking whether the level of trust assigned to the certificate authority corresponds to a level of trust of a trusted certificate authority (column2, lines 8-19) .

Regarding Claim 6

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein the step of validating the certificate comprises the further steps of: comparing the public key included in the response received from the certificate authority filter with a public key included in a response from a second certificate authority filter; and validating the certificate if the public key included in the

response received from the certificate authority filter is the same as the public key received in the response from the second certificate authority filter (column2, lines 8-19).

Regarding Claim 7

Van Oorschot teaches a method, in a certificate authority filter connected to a network, for filtering certificates issued from one or more certificate authorities, the method comprising the steps of: receiving a request comprising an identification of a certificate authority; identifying the certificate authority in said request (column 5, lines 14-25); finding in a table the certificate authority, the table comprising: identification of at least one certificate authority and a level of trust and a public key associated with each of said at least one certificate((column 5, lines 4-13)(examiner considers certificate chain data as applicant's table)) ; determining a level of trust of the identified certificate authority referring to said table ((column 5, lines 62-67)(examiner considers degree of trust as applicant's level of trust)); retrieving a public key associated with the identified certificate authority referring to said table (column 2, lines 8-23); and sending a response to an originator of the request (column 6, lines 1-12), said response comprising the level of trust of the identified certificate authority and the public key associated with the identified certificate authority (column 5, lines 4-13 and 63-67) .

Regarding Claim 8

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 7 above and furthermore he teaches a method wherein said request further comprises an identification

of a destination entity (column 5, lines 4-13)(examiner considers target certification authority as applicant's destination entity).

Regarding Claim 9

Van Oorschot teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 8 above and furthermore he teaches a method, wherein: the table further includes, associated with the certificate authority, the destination entity and a level of trust associated with the destination entity; and wherein the step of determining the level of trust further includes the step of determining the level of trust associated with the destination entity by referring to the table (column 11, lines 24-49 and column 5, lines 62-67).

References Cited, Not Used

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

1. U.S.Patent No. 6,785,810

This reference relates to a method for securely transmitting, searching, and storing data, personal information data storage and retrieval system.

2. U.S.Patent No. 6,367,009

This reference relates to a computer system, for delegating authentication and authority from a client to a server in order that the server can establish a secure connection to a back-end application on behalf of a client.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Abyaneh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571)272-3819. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned as (703) 872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ali Abyaneh A.A
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2133
04/15/05

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100